

REMARKS

In the May 12, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, objected to claims 1 and 32 due to several informalities, rejected claims 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, rejected claims 1-22 and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0111360 to Albanese, and rejected claims 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Albanese. Applicants have amended Figure 1 to overcome the Examiner's objection to that drawing and have amended claims 1, 21-22 and 32 to overcome the Examiner's objections and §112 rejections of those claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections under §§102 and 103. Each pending claim of the present application includes in one form or another the requirement that "a minimum degree of affinity correlation constituting a match *varies depending on the proximity* of said first and second users." This requirement relates to the feature that a broader scope of matches are identified for persons in close proximity while a narrower scope of matches are identified for persons who are not in close proximity. For example, dog lovers may wish to meet each other if they are within a short distance of each other (such as one city block) regardless of the breeds of dogs they own while dog lovers owning the same breed of dog may wish to meet each other if they are within a greater distance (such as several city blocks) and dog lovers that wish to mate dogs of the same breed may wish to meet even if they are a great distance (such as several miles) apart. This aspect of the present invention provides users with a much greater degree of control over the number and types of matches they wish to receive that is available in other systems such as that proposed in Albanese that do not disclose or suggest such a varying relationship between level of affinity and proximity. For at least this reason, the present claims are patentable.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present patent application is in condition for allowance. An early indication of the allowability of the present patent application is therefore respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the undersigned would expedite passage of the present patent application to issue, she is invited to call on the number below.

Applicants request a one-month extension of time for filing this response and hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge the small-entity fee of \$60 for such extension to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-2837. If any other fees are due in connection with this application, including those for the new claims and any necessary extension of time, such fees may be charged to PTO Deposit Account 50-2837.

Respectfully submitted,

24IP Law Group USA, PLLC

By: 

Timothy R. DeWitt
Registration No. 35,857

24IP Law Group USA, PLLC
600 Cameron Street, Ste. 600
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Tel: 703-340-1686
Fax: 703-340-1687

Date: September 12, 2005